

6456 - THE "MISSING" THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT.

AS PRESENTED BY THE AMERICAN STUDIES INSTITUTE.

1997

THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION HAS BEEN EDITED, SIGNIFICANTLY ADDED TO AND REVISED, AND SIMPLIFIED, FROM ITS ORIGINAL WWW PUBLISHED VERSION.

Dear Good-Thinking, Hearty and Ever Constitutionally Loyal Citizens:

Here is an interesting legal issue for you to ponder. According to this and many other sources, there was a 13th Amendment to the Constitution for the United States of America that was removed during the time before or during the Civil War. This Amendment had a very specific intention which is explained in the below text.

Since the original writing/publishing of this report, several researchers, including myself, have found more evidence that conclusively proves that such an Amendment did (and does) in fact exist and was ratified.

I have in my possession, proof of its existence. We examined the "records" of many states and found several copies of this same information. The copies of the Amendment that I have are from many different places and many different sources. Astoundingly, this information is still in the various records, as the papers that I have are mere photocopies of the documents containing the Amendment obtained from various public libraries.

The Missing 13th Amendment

David M. Dodge, Researcher Date 08/01/91.

The Missing 13th Amendment,
"TITLES OF "NOBILITY" AND "HONOR"

In the winter of 1983, archival research expert David Dodge, and former Baltimore police investigator Tom Dunn were searching for evidence of government corruption in public records stored in the Belfast Library on the coast of Maine.

By chance, they discovered the library's oldest authentic copy of the Constitution of the United States (printed in 1825). Both men were stunned to see this document included a 13th Amendment that no longer appears on current copies of the Constitution. Moreover, after studying the Amendment's language and historical context, they realized the principle intent of this "missing" 13th Amendment was to prohibit lawyers from serving in government!

So began a seven-year, nationwide search for the truth surrounding the most bizarre Constitutional puzzle in American history -- the unlawful removal of a duly ratified Amendment from the Constitution of the United States. Since 1983, Dodge and Dunn have uncovered additional copies of the Constitution with the "missing" 13th Amendment printed in at least eighteen separate publications by ten different states and territories over four decades from 1822 to 1860.

In June of this year, Dodge uncovered the evidence that the missing 13th Amendment had *indeed* been lawfully, and therefore legally at the least, ratified by the state of Virginia and was (and is)

therefore an authentic Amendment to the American Constitution. If the evidence is correct and no logical errors have been made, a 13th Amendment restricting lawyers from serving in government, was ratified in 1819 and removed, both unlawfully and therefore illegally (in truth), from our Constitution during the tumult or confusion of the Civil War.

Since the Amendment was never lawfully repealed, it is *still* the Law today! The implications of this are enormous!

The story of this "missing" Amendment is complex and at times confusing because the political issues and vocabulary of the American Revolution were different from our own. However, there are essentially two issues: What does the Amendment mean? and, Was the Amendment ratified? Before we consider the issue of ratification, we should first understand the Amendment's meaning and consequent current relevance.

MEANING of the 13th Amendment:

The "missing" 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States reads as following:

"If any citizen of the United States shall accept, claim, receive, or retain any title of nobility or honour, or shall without the consent of Congress, accept and retain any present, pension, office, or emolument of any kind whatever, from any emperor, king, prince, or foreign power, such person shall cease to be a citizen of the United States, and shall be incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under them, or either of them."

At the first reading, the meaning of this 13th Amendment (also called the "title of nobility" Amendment) seems obscure, unimportant. The references to "nobility," "honour," "emperor," "king," and "prince" lead us to dismiss this Amendment as a petty, post-revolution act of spite directed against the British monarchy. But in our modern world of Lady Di and Prince Charles, anti-royalist sentiments seems so archaic and quaint, that the Amendment (it is believed) can be ignored.

Not so. Consider some evidence of its historical significance: First, "titles of nobility" were prohibited in both Article VI of the Articles of Confederation (1777) and in Article I, Section 9 of the Constitution of the United States (1778); Second, although already prohibited by the Constitution, an additional "title of nobility" amendment was proposed in 1789, again in 1810, and according to Dodge, finally ratified in 1819. Clearly, the founding fathers saw such a serious threat in "titles of nobility" and "honours," that anyone receiving them would forfeit their citizenship. Since the government prohibited "titles of nobility" several times over four decades, and went through the amending process (even though "titles of nobility" were already prohibited by the Constitution), it's obvious that the Amendment carried much more significance for our founding fathers than is readily apparent today.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

To understand the meaning of this "missing" 13th Amendment, we must understand its historical context -- the era surrounding the American Revolution.

We tend to regard the notion of "Democracy" as benign, harmless, and politically unremarkable. But at the time of the American Revolution, King George III and the other monarchies of Europe saw Democracy as an unnatural, ungodly, ideological threat, every bit as dangerously radical as

Communism was regarded by Western nations upon its inception. Just as the 1917 Communist Revolution in Russia spawned other revolutions around the world, the American Revolution

provided an example and incentive for people all over the world to overthrow their European monarchies.

Even though the Treaty of Paris ended the Revolutionary War in 1783, the simple fact of our existence threatened the monarchies. The United States stood as a heroic role model for other nations, that inspired them to also struggle against oppressive monarchies. The French Revolution (1789-1799) and the Polish uprising (1794) were, in part, encouraged by the American Revolution. Though we stood like a beacon of hope for most of the world, the monarchies regarded the United States as a political typhoid Mary, the principle source of radical democracy that was destroying monarchies around the world. The monarchies must have realized that if the principle source of that infection could be destroyed, the rest of the world might avoid the contagion and the monarchies would be saved.

Their survival at stake, the monarchies sought to destroy or subvert the American system of government. Knowing they couldn't destroy us militarily, they resorted to more covert methods of political subversion, employing spies and secret agents skilled in bribery and legal deception - it was perhaps the first "cold war."

CONSPIRACIES

A few examples of the attempts by the monarchies through their banks that almost succeeded in destroying the United States:

According to the Tennessee Laws (1715-1820, vol. II, p. 774), in the 1794 Jay Treaty, the United States agreed to pay 600,000 pounds sterling to King George III, as reparations for the American Revolution. The Senate ratified the treaty in secret session and ordered that it not be published. When Benjamin Franklin's grandson published it anyway, the exposure and resulting public uproar so angered the Congress that it passed the Alien and Sedition Acts (1798) so federal judges could prosecute editors and publishers for reporting the truth about the government.

Since we had won the Revolutionary War, why would our Senators agree to pay reparations to the loser? And why would they agree to pay 600,000 pounds sterling, eleven years *after* the war ended? It doesn't make sense, especially in light of the Senate's secrecy and later fury over

being exposed, unless we assume our Senators *had been bribed to serve the British monarchy and betray the American people! That is subversion!* The United States Bank had been opposed by the Jeffersonians from the beginning, but the Federalists (the pro-monarchy party) won out in its establishment. The initial capitalization was \$10,000,000 -- 80 % of which would be owned by foreign bankers. Since the bank was authorized to lend up to \$20,000,000 (double its paid capital), it was a profitable deal for both government and the bankers, since they could lend, and collect interest on \$10,000,000 that didn't exist.

However, the European bankers outfoxed the U.S. government, and by 1796, the government owed the bank \$6,200,000 and was forced to sell its shares. (By 1802, our government owned no stock in the United States Bank!)

The sheer power of the banks and their ability to influence representative government by economic manipulation and outright bribery was exposed in 1811, when the people discovered that European banking interests owned 80 % of the United States Bank. Congress therefore refused to renew the Bank's charter. This led to the withdrawal of \$7,000,000 in specie (money in coin) by European investors, which in turn, precipitated in economic recession, and the War of 1812.

That's destruction.

There are undoubtedly other examples of the monarchy's efforts to subvert or destroy the United States; some are common knowledge, others remain to be disclosed to the public. For example,

national archivist David Dodge discovered a book called "2 VA LAW" in the Library of Congress Law Library. According to Dodge, "This is an un-catalogued book in the rare book section that reveals a plan to overthrow the Constitutional government by secret agreements engineered by the lawyers of the time." That is one of the reasons why this Amendment was ratified by the state of Virginia in the particular manner in which they did, although the alleged "notification" thereof was a long time thereafter claimed to have been "lost in the mail." You see, there is no public record that this aforementioned book exists either!" That may sound surprising, but according to the Gazette (5/10/91), "the Library of Congress has 349,402 un-catalogued rare books and 13.9 million un-catalogued rare manuscripts." There may be secrets buried in that mass of documents even more astonishing than a missing Constitutional Amendment.

TITLES OF NOBILITY.

Historically, the British peerage system referred to knights as "Squires" and to those who bore the knights shields as "Esquires." As lances, shields and physical violence gave way to the more civilized means of theft, the pen grew mightier (and more profitable) than the sword, and the clever wielders of those pens (concerned here with lawyers) came to hold titles of nobility. The most common title was "Esquire," which denoted a *level* of upper citizenry, more specifically referred to as "gentry," which was a clearly established, honored, respected, and enforced title of nobility. The title of "Esquire" is still used even today by some lawyers, and even where it is not, the principle at law known as the "establishment of a contract or thing by *performance*," the use of the title and position of Esquire Nobility by so many lawyers from those days forward, has clearly established in the minds and hearts of American people that "lawyers" or "attorneys" are somehow above everybody else, having once been universally described as "Esquires," and given different and greater rights by the governments accordingly than the common American people.

INTERNATIONAL BAR ASSOCIATION

In Colonial America, attorneys trained attorneys, but most held no "title of nobility" or "honor." There was no requirement that one be a lawyer to hold the position of district attorney, attorney general, or judge; a citizen's "counsel of choice" was not restricted to a lawyer, there was no state or national bar associations. The only organization that certified lawyers was the International Bar Association (IBA), chartered by the King of England, headquartered in London. Lawyers admitted to the IBA received the rank "Esquire" - a "title of British nobility."

"Esquire was the principle title of nobility which the 13th Amendments ought to prohibit from the United States. Why? Because the loyalty of "Esquire" lawyers was suspect! Lawyers with an "Esquire" behind their names were agents of the monarchy, members of an organization whose principle purposes were political, not economic (and certainly not altruistic), and regarded with the same wariness that some people today reserve for members of the KGB or the CIA.

Article I, Section 9 of the Constitution sought to prohibit the International Bar Association (or any other agency that granted titles of nobility) from operating in America. But the Constitution neglected to specify a penalty, so the prohibition was ignored, and agents of the monarchy

continued to infiltrate and influence the government (as in the Jay Treaty and the U.S. Bank charter incidents). Therefore, a "title of nobility" amendment that specified a penalty (loss of citizenship) was proposed in 1789, and again in 1810. The meaning of the Amendment is seen

in its intent to prohibit persons having titles of nobility and loyalties to foreign governments from voting, holding public office, or using their skills to subvert the government.

According to David Dodge, Tom Dunn, and Webster's Dictionary, the archaic definition of "honor" (as used when the 13th Amendment was ratified) meant anyone "obtaining or having an advantage or privilege over another." A contemporary example of an "honor" granted to only a few Americans is the privilege of being a judge: Lawyers can be judges and exercise the attendant privileges and powers, non-lawyers generally cannot.

By prohibiting "honors," the missing, but now found, Amendment prohibits any advantage or privilege that would grant some citizens an equal opportunity to achieve or exercise political power. Therefore, the second meaning (intent) of the 13th Amendment was to insure political equality among all American citizens, by prohibiting anyone, even government officials, from claiming or exercising a special privilege or power (an "honor") over other citizens.

If this interpretation is correct, both "esquire" and "honor" would be key concepts in the target of the 13th Amendment. Why? Because, while "titles of nobility" no longer apply today precisely as they did back in the early 1800's, political system, it is clearly known that an "esquire" or bar attorney receives far better treatment in and by the courts as well as by the public at large in general, whereas "pro se's" are treated like so much rabble, their opinions are regarded as being next to so much garbage offered, and they are treated pretty much by various government officials, because they are not "esquires" or bar attorneys, as useless eaters, or subjects out of control, and as to the issue of "honor," the concept of "honor" remains relevant, possibly more so today than at any previous time in U.S. history, for they, the "honors," are greatly feared and even revered, even by the esquires who are considered even as being below them.

And as a further example, anyone who had (or has) a specific "immunity" from lawsuits which were not afforded to all citizens, would be enjoying a separate privilege, an "honor," and would therefore forfeit his right to vote or hold public office. Think of the "immunities" from lawsuits that our judges, lawyers, politicians, and bureaucrats currently enjoy, but not as a matter of any Constitutional right. As another example, think of all the "special interest" legislation our government passes: "special interests" are simply euphemisms for "special privileges" (honors). WHAT IF ? (Implications If Restored)

If the missing (but now found) 13th Amendment was restored as by right of the people, "special interests" and "immunities" might be rendered unconstitutional. The prohibition against "honors" (privileges) would compel the entire government to operate under the same laws as the citizens of this nation. Without their current personal immunities (honors), our judges and IRS agents would

be unable to abuse common citizens without fear of legal liability. If this 13th Amendment were restored, our entire government would have to conduct itself according to the same standards of decency, respect, law and liability as the rest of the nation. If this Amendment and the term "honor" were applied today, our government's ability to systematically coerce and abuse the public would be all but eliminated. Imagine. Imagine!

A government without special privileges or immunities. How could we describe it? It would be . . . almost like . . . a government . . . of the people . . . by the people . . . for the people!

Imagine: a government . . . whose members were truly accountable to the public, a government that could not systematically exploit its own people!

It is unheard of . . . it has never been done before. Not ever in the entire history of the world.

Bear in mind that Senator George Mitchell of Maine and the National Archives Director both have conceded that 13th Amendment was proposed by Congress in 1810. However, they explain

that there were seventeen states when Congress proposed the "title of nobility" Amendment, that ratification required the support of thirteen states, but since only twelve states supported the Amendment, it was not, at that time, ratified. The Government Printing Office agrees; it currently prints copies of the Constitution of the United States which includes the "title of nobility" Amendment "as proposed," but as unratified. ??? Why would the Government Printing Office take the trouble of printing what would have been a once-proposed amendment that was never ratified?????!!!! Particularly since they don't bother to print some of the more recent proposed amendments that failed!!!!

ONE VOTE David Dodge says one more state did ratify the Amendment, and he claims he has the evidence to prove it.

RATIFICATION FOUND

In 1789, the House of Representatives compiled a list of possible Constitutional Amendments, some of which would ultimately become our Bill of Rights. The House proposed seventeen; the Senate reduced the list to twelve. During this process that Senator Tristram Dalton (Mass.) proposed an Amendment seeking to prohibit and provide a penalty for any American accepting a "title of Nobility" (RG 46 Records of the U.S. Senate). Although it wasn't passed, this was the first time a "title of nobility" amendment was proposed.

Twenty years later, in January, 1810, Senator Reed, proposed another "Title of Nobility" Amendment (History of Congress, Proceedings of the Senate, p. 529-530). On April 27, 1810, the Senate voted to pass this 13th Amendment by a vote of 26 to 1; the House resolved in the affirmative 87 to 3; and the following resolve was sent to the States for ratification.

"If any citizen of the United States shall accept, claim, receive, or retain any title of nobility or honour, or shall without the consent of Congress, accept and retain any present, pension, office, or emolument of any kind whatever, from any emperor, king, prince, or foreign power, such person shall cease to be a citizen of the United States, and shall be incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under them, or either of them."

The Constitution requires three-quarters of the states to ratify a proposed amendment before it may be added to the Constitution. When Congress proposed the "Title of Nobility" Amendment in 1810, there were seventeen states, thirteen of which would have to ratify for the Amendment to be adopted. According to the National Archives, the following is a list of the twelve states that ratified, and their dates of ratification:

Maryland, -----	Dec. 25, 1810	Vermont, -----	Oct. 24, 1811
Kentucky, -----	Jan. 31, 1811	Tennessee, -----	Nov. 21, 1811
Ohio, -----	Jan. 31, 1811	Georgia, -----	Dec. 13, 1811
Delaware, -----	Feb. 2, 1811	North Carolina, --	Dec. 23, 1811
Pennsylvania, ---	Feb. 6, 1811	Massachusetts, --	Feb. 27, 1812
New Jersey, ---	Feb. 13, 1811	New Hampshire, --	Dec. 10, 1812

Before a Thirteenth state could ratify, the War of 1812 broke out with England. By the time the war ended in 1814, the British had burned the Capitol, the Library of Congress, and *most of the records of the first 38 years of government*. Whether there was a connection between the proposed "title of nobility" amendment and the War of 1812 is not known. However, the momentum to ratify the proposed Amendment was lost in the tumult of war. The fact that American Troops were sent out of the city of Washington D. C., followed by a British invasion

therein - which burned the Secretary of State's building to the ground - certainly indicates that something of consequential mischief was afoot even at that very time.

Then, four years later, on December 31, 1817, the House of Representatives resolved that President Monroe inquire into the status of this Amendment. In a letter dated February 6, 1818, President Monroe reported to the House that the Secretary of State Adams had written to the governors of Virginia, South Carolina, and Connecticut to tell them that the proposed Amendment had been ratified by twelve States and rejected by two (New York and Rhode Island), and asked the governors to notify him of their legislature's position. (House Document No. 76)

This, and other letters written by the President and the Secretary of State during the month of February, 1818, note only that the proposed Amendment *had not* yet been ratified. However, these letters would many, many years later become crucially used against the 13th Amendment, because in the absence of contradicting additional information, they would be deliberately misinterpreted by some obvious parties to mean that the Amendment was never ratified.

On February 28, 1818, Secretary of State John Quincy Adams, reported the rejection of the Amendment by South Carolina. [House Doc. 129]. There are no further entries regarding the 13th Amendment in the Journals of Congress; as to whether Virginia ratified is *either* confirmed or *denied*. Likewise, a search through the executive papers of Governor Preston of Virginia does not reveal any correspondence from Secretary of State J. Q. Adams, Esquire. (However, there is a journal entry in the Virginia House that the Governor presented the House with an official letter and documents from Washington within a time frame that conceivably includes receipt of Adam's letter.) Again, no evidence of ratification; none of denial.

However, again, on March 10, 1819, the Virginia legislature passed Act No. 280 (Virginia Archives of Richmond, "misc. file, p. 299 for micro-film"):

"Be it enacted by the General Assembly, that there shall be published an edition of the Laws of this Commonwealth in which shall be contained the following matters, that is to say, the Constitution of the united States and the amendments thereto. . . ."

This act was the specific legislated instruction on what was, by law, to be included in the re-publication (a *special* edition) of the Virginia Civil Code. The Virginia Legislature had already agreed that all Acts were to go into effect on the same day, the day that the Act to re-publish the Civil Code was enacted. Therefore, the 13th Amendment's official date of ratification would be the date of re-publication of the Virginia Civil Code: "**March 12, 1819.**"

The Delegates *knew* Virginia was the last of the 13 States that were necessary for the ratification of the 13th Amendment. They also *knew* there were powerful forces allied against this ratification, so they took *extraordinary measures* to make sure that it was published in sufficient quantity (4,000 copies) were ordered, almost triple their usual order), and *instructed the printer* to send a copy to James Madison and Thomas Jefferson, as well as a copy to President James Monroe. (The printer, Thomas Ritchie, was bonded. He was required to be extremely accurate in his research and his printing, or he would forfeit his bond.)

In this fashion, Virginia announced the ratification: by publication and dissemination of the Thirteenth Amendment of the Constitution. There is only the question as to whether Virginia ever formally notified the Secretary of State that they had ratified this 13th Amendment. Some have argued that because such notification was not received (or at least, *not recorded*), the

Amendment was therefore not legally ratified, however the Constitution does not require *who* that a state, any state, must report its ratification to, and *one would be proper and legally correct to believe* that a report sent to (or technically, legally served upon) the President of the United States, the *highest* office in the land, would be more than adequate for purposes of the Constitutional Ratification process; after all, the Fifth Article of the Constitution only prescribes *who* shall propose an amendment and *how* and by *whom* it must be ratified, not whom it must be reported to, and a printing by a legislature, as directed by a legislature pursuant to its official act, IS *prima facie* evidence of **Ratification!**

Further, there is no Constitutional requirement that the Secretary of State (as a specifically ordained official of government), *or anyone else*, be officially notified to complete the Ratification process. The Constitution only requires that three-fourths of the states ratify for an Amendment to be added to the Constitution. If three-quarters of the states ratify, the Amendment is passed. Period. The Constitution is otherwise silent on what procedure should be used to announce, confirm, or communicate the ratification of amendments.

Knowing they were the last state necessary to ratify the Amendment, the Virginians had every right to announce their own and the nation's ratification of the Amendment by publishing it on a special edition of the Constitution, and so they did.

Word of Virginia's 1819 ratification spread throughout the States and both Rhode Island and Kentucky published the new Amendment in 1822. Ohio first published in 1824. Maine ordered 10,000 copies of the Constitution with the 13th Amendment to be printed for use in the schools in 1825, and again in 1831 for their Census Edition. Indiana Revised Laws of 1831 published

the 13th Article of Amendment on p. 20. Northwestern Territories published in 1833. Ohio published in 1831 and 1833. Then came the Wisconsin Territory in 1839; Iowa Territory in 1843; Ohio again, in 1848; Kansas Statutes in 1855; and Nebraska Territory six times in a row from 1855 to 1860.

So far, David Dodge has identified eleven different states or territories that printed the Amendment in twenty separate publications over forty-one years. And more editions including this 13th Amendment are sure to be discovered. Clearly, Dodge is onto something.

You might be able to convince some of the people, or maybe even all of them, for a little while, that this 13th Amendment was never ratified. Maybe you can show then that ten legislatures which ordered it published eighteen times we've discovered (so far) consisted of ignorant politicians who don't know their amendments from their . . . ahh, articles. You might even be able to convince the public that our forefathers never meant to "outlaw" public servants who pushed people around, accepted bribes or special favors to "look the other way." Maybe. But before you do, there's an awful lot of evidence to be explained.

THE AMENDMENT "DISAPPEARS"

In 1829, the following note appears on p. 23, Vol. 1 of the New York Revised Statutes:

"In the edition of the Laws of the U.S. before referred to, there is an amendment printed as article 13, prohibiting citizens from accepting titles of nobility or honor, or presents, offices, etc., from foreign nations. But, by a *message* of the president of the United States of the 4th of February, 1818, in answer to a resolution of the house of representatives, it appears that this amendment had been ratified by only 12 states, and therefore had not been adopted. See Vol. I of the printed papers of the 1st session of the 15th congress, No. 76."

In 1854, a similar note appeared in the Oregon Statutes. Both notes refer to the Laws of the United States, Vol. I, 1st session, p. 73 (or 74).

This was the reference to the "letters" or "messages" that I mentioned earlier, which took place before the Virginia March 12, 1819 Amendment publication event. And who might have actually been the President of the United States at the time the New York statute was "passed," to help fight against and try to (illegally) overturn the true 13th Amendment (keep in mind that an entire war had been illegally caused just to try to stop the progress of this Amendment)? In 1824, John Quincy Adams (remember "Esquire" John Quincy Adams who was Secretary of State in 1818, under President Monroe, who also was one of the ones who had written and knew of certain letters written, noting that the Amendment had not "at that time" been passed?) and his party succeeded in capturing the White House. Consequently, commencing in the year of 1825, President John Quincy Adams began what was considered to be an uneventful term in office, hardly raising an issue of noteworthy consideration as he had in Congress prior to his term as President. And it was therefore in the year of 1829 that John Quincy Adams was still President, and was not necessarily powerless politically as some "lame duck" presidents might have been considered to be.

So all of these things considered, it was certainly no accident or coincidence that the New York statute was passed to bolster J.Q. Adams fight against the Amendment, for it is long known as to the attitudes of certain kinds of people, that even when having to give up a certain thing is known to be better for them, as for everybody else, they still hang on to that evil thing which has been instilled into them by the devil no less, or as by some negative force from within that causes them to resist giving up the thing abhorred to the very last. Next to John Marshall, I would rate John Quincy Adams as the most evil man in American History.

It should be now noted here, that as a matter of legality in passing or denying the effectiveness of an Amendment, a state's statutes so passed, cannot be called upon or relied upon to determine any such a thing as legal fact. And that fact causes me to now reflect more curiously and seriously on still another set of facts. New York, having had strong British sentiments prior to the War of 1812, was one of the 2 states that voted to reject the 13th Amendment. But that fact notwithstanding, although it does show obvious motive as to why New York would be, as a state, engaged in any act to subvert the Amendment that it itself had previously rejected, does not explain why it would go so far as to actually pass a statute, *or even think it necessary to*, which would try to disclaim an Amendment that allegedly had never passed in the first place, even in some controversial sense, for if the Amendment had never passed as the state of New York claimed, the letter (or "message") by President James Monroe would scarcely have been an issue worth mentioning in a law! You will note that, President John Quincy Adams, obviously utilizing his political muscle through New York State, did not release any information about a presidential message being issue after March 12, 1819.

But the effect of the "powerful and prestigious state of New York" passing such a proclamation as an Act just as Virginia had done earlier, in an effort to defeat Virginia's own official and legal publication of its own Act, was to cause confusion and distrust whenever and wherever it could. Which to a certain extent, it did. *Shame* on the historical state of New York in taking such an underhanded tactic to get rid of a lawfully passed Amendment that it simply did not like. New York, as a state to be esteemed whatsoever pursuant to its own history and involvement in this affair, should not impress anyone in this whole United States a bit, including its very own citizens.

Nevertheless, both statutes, the New York statute and the Oregon statute each referred to the existence of this law referred to as Laws of the United States, Vol. I, 1st session, p. 73 (or 74) (or

76). It is clear, however, that the 13th Amendment was NOT published in the Laws of the United States, 1st Volume, by accident, or as part of a plot to discredit the Amendment later by making it appear that only twelve States had ratified (what would be the point if it weren't truly Ratified to begin with?). . . . (this would be a ludicrous assumption).

There were two (2) official witnesses (states) who officially recognized this "Law's" existence! However, the Law of the United States, Vol. 1, carrying the Amendment, was apparently just "covered-up." The fact is, the Law Library of the Library of Congress has no record of the Law's existence!?? With two (2) states *testifying* of the law's existence, even though negatively, as though trying to discredit (cover-up) the Amendment, the law's *current* condition of *apparent* inexistence smacks of an attempt of "cover-up" by *somebody*, even as early as 1829 and 1854; the Law certainly must have actually existed, in truth, at one time. Note also that a statute passed by a state does not have the legal effect of overturning or nullifying a U.S. Law, much less a Constitutional Amendment lawfully passed.

However, the authors reported no further references to the 13th Amendment beyond the Presidential letter of February, 1818; they (supposedly) assumed (or, more likely, proposed) that the ratification process had ended in failure at that time. If so, they neglected (on purpose) to seek information on the Amendment *after* 1818, or at the state level, and therefore "missed" the evidence of Virginia's ratification. Their *opinions* -- assuming that the Presidential letter of February, 1818, was the last word on the Amendment -- has persisted in *their* states, to this day. In 1849, Virginia (or certain political parties therein) decided to revise the 1819 Civil Code of Virginia (which had contained the 13th Amendment for 39 years). It was at that time that one of the code's revisers (a {conflict of interest} Virginia lawyer named Patton) wrote to the Secretary of the Navy, William B. Preston, asking if this Amendment had been ratified by mistake. Preston then wrote to J.M. Clayton, the Secretary of State, who replied that this Amendment was not ratified by a sufficient number of States. This conclusion, or opinion, by Clayton was based upon the information that Secretary of State, Esquire John Quincy Adams had provided the House of Representatives in 1818, *before* Virginia's ratification in 1819, and because he, Clayton, had no "certificate of ratification" in his immediate possession. (Even today, the Congressional Research Service tells anyone asking about this 13th Amendment this same story, that only twelve states, not the requisite Thirteen, had ratified.) However, despite Clayton's opinion, the Amendment continued to be published in various states and territories for at least another eleven years (the last known publication was in the Nebraska territory in *1860).

* See latest developments further on in this document.

It is also quite interesting to note that, since the wording of the True 13th Amendment contains no mention or reference to the word "attorney" or "lawyer," etc., that future Esquire Patton immediately *seized upon the Amendment's intent and effect* so as to allegedly raise his eyebrows with concern so. But why? Or did someone seek him out to so advise him of the Amendment's real meaning, and to plot with him as to how to effectively (for the good of the future of Virginia, of course) challenge the Amendment, so that the Virginia Code could be re-established thereafter without that accursed Amendment in it?

Here is an awesome realization: For all of those years, the Virginia Civil Code, regardless of what others in other states might be saying, want to say, or were doing in regard to the 13th Amendment issue, the fact remains that while it was a public law in Virginia, such a law would

have prevented any form of bar association, or any other acts of "honors" from taking place therein without the possibility of dire consequences. Now think about that! And only by revising the Virginia Civil Code with those bar-loving-attorneys' hated-Amendment being eradicated forever therefrom (or without the 13th Amendment being any longer in it) as a matter of "new" or "revised" Virginia Law, the chance of any of those "*good wicked things*" or real corrupt acts in government ever happening was little to none.

Bear in mind also that in 1849 the ever-continuing conspiracy (for it never really ceased) by England, by the Bank of England, and by their wicked American conspiratorial counterparts, who hated the idea that "the people" as Abraham Lincoln was to thereafter refer to in his Gettysburg speech, had so much power against corrupt government, was beginning to rise again, ever stronger than before, for the elements of the wicked power of the bar had "too long been suppressed" by this "hated Amendment," hated by all attorneys who lusted after power, and were consumed by greediness after lucre. This would set the stage later for the advent of the terrible, power-mad "American Bar Association's" creation.

Once again, the 13th Amendment was caught in the riptides of American politics. South Carolina seceded from the Union in December of 1860, signaling the onset of the Civil War. In March, 1861, President Abraham Lincoln was inaugurated. Later in 1861, another proposed amendment, also now claimed as "number thirteen" (thanks to esquire Patton and secretary of state Clayton only 12 years earlier), was signed by President Lincoln. This was the only proposed amendment that was ever signed by a president. That resolve to amend read:

"ARTICLE THIRTEEN, No amendment shall be made to the Constitution which will authorize or give to Congress the power to abolish or interfere, within any State, with the domestic institutions thereof, including that of persons held to labor or service by the law of said State."

(In other words, President Lincoln had signed a resolve that would have permitted slavery, and upheld states' rights.) Only one State, Illinois, ratified this proposed amendment before the Civil War broke out in 1861. Could it be that there was more to President Lincoln's assassination than has met the historical eye? Could it be that his murder was orchestrated by members of his own political party, because they knew that he would never *knowingly* go along with their plans to subvert the Constitution and gain power? Could the murder of Abraham Lincoln been the signal for someone within the Secretary of State's office to begin the act of complete and final "cover up?" So that the Bank of England, via the alleged monarchy or King of England could once again gain control over the United States? By the use of lawyers as members of the Bar, soon established after the end of the Civil War, it once again became a viable possibility.

In the tumult of 1865, the original and true 13th Amendment was finally "removed" (by cover up) from our Constitution. On January 31st, *another* 13th (?) Amendment (which prohibited slavery in Sect. 1, and ended states' rights in Sect. 2) was proposed. On April 9, the Civil War ended with General Lee's surrender. On April 14, President Lincoln (who, in 1861, had signed the proposed Amendment that would have allowed slavery and states rights) was assassinated. On December 6, the "new" 13th Amendment loudly *prohibiting* slavery (and quietly surrendering states' rights (to slavery) to the federal government, for absolution) was ratified, "replacing" and effectively "erasing" the original and true 13th Amendment that had prohibited "titles of nobility" and "honors," in line and in keeping with Article I, Section 9, Clause 8, and with Article I, Section 10, Clause 1, both of which already existed in the Constitution of the United States of America.

SIGNIFICANCE OF REMOVAL

To create the present oligarchy (rule by lawyers) which we now endure, the lawyers first had to remove the 13th "titles of nobility" Amendment that might otherwise have kept them in check. In fact, it was not until after the Civil War and after the disappearance of this 13th Amendment, that American bar associations began to appear and exercise political power. It is no small coincidence as to the connection between these two events!!!

Since the unlawful deletion of the 13th Amendment, the *newly developing* bar associations began working diligently to create a system wherein lawyers took on a title of privilege and nobility as "Esquires" and received the "honor" of offices and positions (like district attorney or judge) that only lawyers may now hold. By virtue of these "titles," "honors," and special privileges, lawyers have assumed political and economic advantages over the majority of U.S. citizens. Through these privileges, they have nearly established a two-tiered citizenship in this nation where a majority may vote, but only a minority (lawyers) may run for certain key political

offices. This two-tiered citizenship is clearly contrary to Americans' political interests, the nation's economic welfare, and the Constitution's egalitarian spirit.

The significance of this missing 13th Amendment and its deletion from the Constitution is this: Since the Amendment was never lawfully nullified, it is still in full force and effect and *is* the Law of the Land. If public support could be awakened, this missing Amendment might provide a legal basis to challenge many existing laws and court decisions previously made by lawyers who were unconstitutionally elected or appointed to their positions of power, it might even mean the removal of lawyers from our current government system.

At the very least, this missing - or corruptly covered up in an attempt to nullify it by hiding it, but now found and to be held forth once again in its proper place - 13th Amendment, demonstrates that two centuries ago, lawyers, particularly those who were members of the bar, were recognized as enemies of the people and nation. Some things never change.

In 1788, Thomas Jefferson proposed that we have a Declaration of Rights similar to Virginia's. Three of his suggestions were "freedom of commerce against monopolies," "trial by jury in all cases" and "no suspensions of the habeas corpus."

Yet, the denial of trial by jury is now commonplace in our courts, and habeas corpus, for crimes against the state, suspended. (By crimes against the state, reference is made to "political crimes" where there is no injured party and the corpus delicti [evidence] is equally imaginary.)

The authority to create monopolies was judge-made law, established by Supreme Court John Marshall after his famous seizure of power for the supreme Court in 1803; a man who Lysander Spooner (an 1850's lawyer, no less) proclaimed John Marshall to be the most evil man in the history of American politics. And he was very probably right.

In addition to the above information already established, new information has also now been discovered. More information has been received from a researcher in Indiana, and another in Dallas, who have found five more editions of statutes that include the Constitution and the missing, but now found, 13th Amendment.

These editions were printed by Ohio, 1819; Connecticut (one of the states that voted against ratifying the 13th Amendment), in 1835; Kansas, in 1861; and the Colorado Territory, in 1865 and 1867.

These finds are important because: (1) they offer independent confirmation of Dodge's claims; and (2) they extend the known dates of publication from Nebraska 1860 (Dodge's most recent find), to Colorado in 1867.

The most intriguing discovery was the 1867 Colorado Territory edition which includes both the "missing" 13th Amendment and the current 13th Amendment (freeing the slaves, on the same page). The current 13th Amendment is listed as the 14th Amendment in the 1867 Colorado edition.

This investigation has followed a labyrinthine path that started with the questions about how our courts evolved from a temple of the Bill of Rights to the current star chamber, and whether this situation had anything to do with retiring chief Justice Burger's warning that we were "about to lose our constitution."

The True 13th Amendment would have restricted at least some lawyers (members of the bar) from serving in government in any capacity whatsoever, and would prohibit legislatures, or even the non-bar lawyers able to serve therein, from passing any special interest legislation, tax breaks, or special immunities for anyone (even judges), not even for themselves ("honors"). Since 1983, researchers, working together and separately, have uncovered evidence that (1) the 13 Amendment prohibiting "titles of nobility" and "honors" appeared in at least 30 editions of the Constitution of the United States which were printed by at least 14 states or territories between 1819 and 1867, and (2) This amendment quietly disappeared from the Constitution near the end of the Civil War, and bar associations sprang up in the wake of its disappearance.

ONLY TWO POSSIBILITIES EXIST

Either this Amendment:

(1) Was unratified and "mistakenly" published for almost 50 years, or

(2) Was ratified in 1819 as indicated previously, and then illegally removed from the Constitution in 1865 and completely covered up by not later than 1867.

Unless we think it conceivable to believe that everyone who participated in the publishing of this Amendment for all of those years, in all of those states and territories, in all of those publications, were simply but clowns and fools, with nothing better to do with their time and money, since

printing and publishing *does* cost a certain amount of *money*, then there can be only one true answer: We DO have a 13th Amendment which was targeted at forbidding some, if not all, lawyers (members of the Bar), *under extreme penalty*, the loss of citizenship, *from holding any public office*, particularly if they had received and *maintained*, a title of nobility, in any government whatever within the "United States, or either of them."

THOSE WHO SUPPORT THE TRUE 13TH AMENDMENT, AND THOSE WHO DO NOT.
TWO SIDES.

Of course, there are two sides to this issue; one right and one wrong. You decide which is right and which is wrong. David Dodge, the principle researcher, argues that this 13th Amendment was ratified in 1819 and then subverted from the Constitution near the end of the Civil War. U.S. Senator George Mitchell of Maine, and Mr. Dane Hartgrove (Acting Assistant Chief, Civil Reference Branch of the National Archives) have argued that the Amendment was never properly ratified and only published in error.

There is some agreement. Both sides agree that the Amendment was proposed by Congress in 1810. Both sides also agree that the proposed Amendment required the support of at least 13 states to be ratified. Both sides agree that between 1810 and 1812 twelve states voted to support ratification.

The pivotal issue is whether Virginia ratified or rejected the proposed Amendment. Dodge contends Virginia voted to support the Amendment in 1819, and so the Amendment was truly ratified and should still be a part of the Constitution. Senator and Mr. Hartgrove disagree, arguing that Virginia did not ratify.

Unfortunately, several decades of Virginia's legislative journals were misplaced or destroyed (on purpose?) possibly during the Civil War, possibly during the 1930's). Consequently, other than the aforementioned Virginia State Act passed by the Virginia Legislature establishing the March 12, 1819 official publishing date containing the True Thirteenth Amendment therein, neither side has found, at this time, absolute proof that the Virginia legislature voted for (or against) ratification. However, it should be considered noteworthy to point out that in view of the March 12, 1819 publication issue, it is *prima facie* that there is more evidence that was in fact passed by Virginia than there is evidence that it did not, for there is absolutely no evidence, other than a certain lawyer's speculation and the Secretary of State's flawed theory, that it did not.

A series of letters exchanged in 1991 between David Dodge, Senator Mitchell, and Mr. Hartgrove illuminate the various points of disagreement.

After Dodge's initial report of a "missing" Amendment in the 1825 Maine Civil Code, Senator Mitchell explained that the edition was a one-time publishing error:

"The Maine Legislature mistakenly printed the proposed Amendment in the Maine Constitution as having been adopted. As you know, this was a mistake, as it was not ratified."

Further, "all editions of the Maine Constitution printed after 1820 [sic] exclude the proposed amendment; only the originals contain this error." Dodge dug deeper, found other editions (there are 30, to date) of state and territorial civil codes that contained the missing, but now found, Amendment, and thereby demonstrated that the Maine publication was not a "one-time" publishing error.

YES VIRGINIA, THERE WAS A RATIFICATION

After examining Dodge's evidence of multiple publications of the "missing" Amendment, Senator Mitchell and Mr. Hartgrove conceded the Amendment had been published by several states and was ratified by twelve of the seventeen states in the Union in 1810. However, because the Constitution requires that three-quarters of the states vote to ratify an Amendment, Mitchell and Hartgrove insisted that the 13th Amendment was published in error because it was passed by only twelve, not thirteen States.

Dodge investigated which seventeen states were in the Union at the time the Amendment was proposed, which states had ratified, which states had rejected the amendment, and determined that the issue hung on whether one last state (Virginia) had or had not, voted to ratify. After several years of searching the Virginia state archives, Dodge made a crucial discovery: In Spring of 1991, he found a misplaced copy of the 1819 Virginia Civil Code which included the "missing" 13th Amendment.

Dodge notes that, curiously, "There is no public record that shows that this book [the 1819 Virginia Civil Code] exists. It is not catalogued as a holding of the Library of Congress nor is it in the National Union Catalogue. Neither the state law library nor the law school in Portland were able to find any trace that this book exists in any of their computer programs."

Dodge sent photo-copies of the 1819 Virginia Civil Code to Senator Mitchell and Mr. Hartgrove, and explained that, "Under legislative construction, it is considered prima facie evidence that what is published as the official acts of the legislature are the official acts." By publishing the Amendment as ratified in an official publication, Virginia demonstrated: (1) that they knew they were the last state whose vote was necessary to ratify this 13th Amendment; (2) that they had voted to ratify the Amendment; and (3) that they were publishing the Amendment in a special edition of their Civil Code as an official notice to the world that the Amendment had indeed been ratified.

Dodge concluded, "Unless there is competing evidence to the contrary, it must be held that the Constitution of the United States was officially amended to exclude from its body of citizens any who accepted or claimed a title of nobility or accepted any special favors. Foremost in this category of ex-citizens are bankers and *lawyers." *ie. members of the bar association.

RATIONALES (for Ratification)

Undeterred, Senator Mitchell wrote that, "Article XIII did not receive the three-fourths vote required from the states within the time limit to be ratified." (Although his language is imprecise, Senator Mitchell seems to concede that although the Amendment had failed to satisfy the "time limit," the required three-quarters of the states did vote to ratify.)

Dodge replies: "Contrary to your assertion . . . , there was no time limit for amendment ratification in 1811. *Any time limit is now established by Congress in the Resolves* for proposed amendments.

"In fact, *ratification time limits did not start until 1917*, when Section 3 of the Eighteenth Amendment stated that:

"This Article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified within seven years from the date of submission . . . to the States by Congress."

A similar time limit is now included on other proposed Amendments, but *there was no specified time limit when the 13th Amendment was proposed in 1810 or ratified in 1819.*

Senator Mitchell remained determined to find some rationale, somewhere, that would defeat Dodge's persistence. Although Senator Mitchell implicitly conceded that his "published by error" and "time limit" arguments were invalid, he continued to grope for reasons to dispute the Ratification:

"regardless of whether the state of Virginia did ratify the proposed Thirteenth Amendment on March 12, 1819, this approval would have not been sufficient to amend the Constitution. In 1819, there were twenty-one states in the United States and any amendment would have required approval of sixteen states to amend the Constitution. According to your own research, Virginia would have only been the thirteenth state to approve the proposed amendment."

Dodge replies: "Article V [amendment procedures] of the Constitution is silent on the question of whether or not the framers meant three-fourths of the states at the time the proposed amendment is submitted to the states for ratification, or three-fourths of the states that exist at

some future point in time. Since only the existing states were involved in the debate and vote of Congress on the Resolve proposing an Amendment, it is reasonable that ratification be limited to those States that took an active part in the Amendment process."

Dodge demonstrates this rationale by pointing out that, "President Monroe had his Secretary of State . . . [ask the] governors of Virginia, South Carolina, and Connecticut, in January, 1818, as to the status of the amendment in their respective states. The four new states (Louisiana, Indiana, Mississippi, and Illinois) that were added to the union between 1810 and 1818 were "not even considered"." (italics added)

From a modern perspective, it seems strange that not all states would be included in the ratification process. But bear in mind that our perspective is based on life in a stable nation that has added only five new states in this century -- about one every eighteen years. However, between 1803 and 1821 (when the 13th Amendment ratification drama unfolded), they added eight states -- almost one every two years. This rapid national growth undoubtedly fostered attitudes different from our own. The government had to be filled with the euphoria of a growing Republic that expected to quickly add new states all the way to the Pacific Ocean and the Isthmus of Panama. The government would not willingly compromise or complicate that growth potential with procedural obstacles; to involve every new state in each *on-going* ratification could inadvertently slow the nation's growth.

For example, if a territory petitioned to join the Union while an Amendment was being considered, its access to statehood might depend on whether the territory expected to ratify or reject a proposed amendment. If the territory was expected to ratify the amendment, government officials who favored the amendment might try to accelerate the territory's entry into

the Union. On the other hand, those opposed to the amendment might try to slow or even deny a particular territory's statehood. These complications could unnecessarily slow the entry of new states into the nation, or restrict the nation's ability to pass new amendments. Neither possibility could appeal to politicians.

Whatever the reason, the House of Representatives, along with President James Monroe, resolved to ask only Connecticut, South Carolina, and Virginia for their decision on ratifying the 13th Amendment -- they did not ask the decisions of the four new states. Since the new states had Representatives in the House who *did not protest when the resolve was passed*, it is apparent that even *the new states agreed that they should not be included* in the ratification process.

In 1818, the President, the House of Representatives, the Secretary of State, the four "new" states, and the seventeen "old" states, all clearly believed that the support of just Thirteen states was required to ratify the 13th Amendment. That being so, Virginia's vote to ratify was legally and lawfully sufficient to ratify the "missing" Amendment in 1819 (and would still be so today).

INSULT TO INJURY

Apparently persuaded by Dodge's various arguments and proofs that the "missing" 13th Amendment had satisfied the Constitutional requirements for ratification, Mr. Hartgrove (National Archives) wrote back that Virginia had nevertheless failed to satisfy the *bureaucracy's* procedural requirements for ratification:

"Under *current* legal provisions, the Archivist of the United States is empowered to certify that he has in his custody the correct number of states certificates of ratification of a proposed constitutional amendment to constitute its ratification by the United States of

America as a whole. In the nineteenth century, that function was performed by the *Secretary of State*. Clearly, the *Secretary of State* never received a certificate of ratification of the title of nobility amendment from the Commonwealth of Virginia, which is why that amendment failed to become the Thirteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution." (emphasis added)

This is an extraordinary admission!

Mr. Hartgrove, whether or not knowingly, implicitly concedes that the 13th Amendment was Ratified by Virginia, and therefore, accordingly, satisfied the Constitution's Ratification requirements. However, Hartgrove insists that the Ratification was nevertheless justly denied (?) because the Secretary of State at that time (who just happens to have been later President John Quincy Adams, a lawyer, specifically an Esquire, and originally a Federalist, or Royalist, or Monarchist, who believed in the power of the central government over all, and in the courts and lawyers or barristers {of which he himself was one}, over the rights of the people, and whose actual trustability, honesty, and integrity is now called strongly into question) was not (?) *properly* (?) notified with a "certificate of ratification" (a document easily gotten rid of by a *corrupt* secretary of state, or an assistant thereto, and very easily gotten rid of in such a tumult as a Civil War would create).

In other words, the government's last, *best* argument that the 13th Amendment was not Ratified, boils down to this: Though the Amendment satisfied Constitutional requirements for Ratification, it is nonetheless missing from our Constitution simply because a single, "official paper" is allegedly "missing" in Washington. Mr. Hartgrove implies that despite the fact that three-quarters of the States in the Union voted to ratify an Amendment, the will of the legislators and the people of this nation should be denied because somebody screwed up and lost (?) a single "certificate of ratification."

This final excuse by Mr. Hartgrove insults every American's political rights, and the protection afforded, or that would be afforded them, but Mr. Hartgrove nevertheless, offers a glimmer of hope. "If the National Archives received a 'certificate of ratification' of the title of nobility amendment from the Commonwealth of Virginia, we would inform Congress and await further developments." Mr. Hartgrove should have added "or the legal equivalent thereto" after his word "ratification." In other words, the issue of whether this 13th Amendment was ratified and "is or is not" a legitimate Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, is not merely a historical curiosity -- the ratification issue is *still* alive.

THE TRUTH ABOUT VIRGINIA'S RATIFICATION. WHY NO CERTIFICATE OF RATIFICATION?

STOP LOOKING FOR IT. THERE ISN'T ONE. The reason that no one can find the "missing" Certificate of Ratification is because no such Certificate exists. That is what I said; no Certificate exists! In fact, it never did, and for a very good reason, not because Virginia did not actually ratify the Amendment, because they did, but rather because at the time that Virginia was to ratify the Amendment, a particular thing existed that caused the Legislative Fathers of Virginia to greatly distrust, and rightfully so, the accepted ratification method currently in use, or commonly practiced, at that particular time, the method of a state issuing a Certificate of Ratification to the Federal Government, to be ultimately recorded and kept on file by the Secretary of State.

WHAT WAS THE PROBLEM THAT VIRGINIA HAD ABOUT RATIFYING THE AMENDMENT IN THE USUAL WAY?

A definite problem existed at the time that Virginia's turn came around to ratify or not ratify the 13th Amendment. Here's how it all came about.

John Quincy Adams, son of former President and Federalist (or Royalist) John Adams, after graduating Harvard College in 1787, entered into the study or reading of law in the office of the distinguished jurist (judge), Theophilus Parsons, in Newburyport, Mass. In the early days of the United States, any person so deciding unto themselves that they had the skills and understanding necessary to do so, could declare themselves a lawyer, and enter into practice with no real

formality or approval from anyone in particular. A good example of this would be Abraham Lincoln himself, who had a very limited education as far as "book learning" was concerned, yet, even though he failed in the "practice" of law as a business profession, he was nevertheless reputed to have been one (an attorney), without even being formally educated in law as was John Quincy Adams.

During the days of the proposal of this famous Amendment, though some of America's greatest patriots existed at that time, the great men of Virginia were also aware of the fact that some of these seemingly great men were, in reality, two faced traitors, more skilled at "innocent deception" than in praying long winded prayers in opening session in Congress and in performing other acts of purported patriotic merit, who would just as quickly sell their American patriotic brethren out for personal gain, as not. Conspiracies had long before already been discovered to surface, evil and malicious conspiracies that purported to destroy the United States government by reducing it to bankrupt status, ultimately to sap up the new found freedom of the American people, such as it was even back then, and return the American people back to a monarchy, where they belonged!

Virginia's founding fathers, men of some great renown and wisdom, inspired men of God, knew that it would be a fatal mistake to under estimate the enemy, for even though the use of ammunition had stopped, the war against good and evil still raged on. Sending a Certificate of Ratification to the government of the United States would be no problem for Virginia any more than it would be for any other state. But that was not the real issue here; the issue was one of trust, deception and corruption.

No bar association existed on American soil in the early 1800's *which had its original residence here*, however the notorious International Bar Association had, as a matter of fact, its legal tentacles here, with its main body being back in London, England, being there under the sovereign authority of King George III. And this was, after all, the very reason for the Amendment to begin with, *because barristers, or attorneys at bar, were ripping the security of our country apart.*

Being admitted to practice was the act of a bar association, and in 1790, John Quincy Adams was *admitted* to practice. Since there were no other bar associations in the country at the time except for the International Bar Association, under King George III of England, it could only be to that Bar that he was admitted, and to have been admitted, he would have had to taken upon himself the title of Esquire, the title that a barrister or attorney was given by the royalty of England, a position of nobility just below knight and just above that of gentleman. Furthermore, it has now been learned that **the word BAR stands for, and means, BRITISH ACCREDITATION REGISTRY!!!** This further establishes the evil conspiracy of the acts by England and the World Bankers thereof (the Rothschilds, etc.) to entrench Bar associations (even if supposedly only as American Bar Associations) in this country in an effort to continue the corrupt practices

of world control by the Money Masters, or World Bankers, who have used attorneys or lawyers or barristers ever since such occupations were first recognized in the world historically. And to be admitted to any BAR is automatically a establishment of a title of nobility under the concepts of nobility as was held up before the English people from the times of ancient English days and years gone by.

John Quincy Adams himself, then, was a nobleman, as a member of England's (not America's) **BRITISH ACCREDITATION REGISTRY**, by having been granted title thereto as an Esquire, a nobleman, under King George III, of England, and this is the very thing that the true 13th Amendment was proposed to stop. But John Quincy Adams was not to content to just maintain himself in law; he had a thirst for higher positions of power and grandeur; he had his eye on the presidency of the United States, like his father before him. A traitor, a subject to the crown of England, in sheep's clothing. This man should never have been allowed to become a President.

Virginians' knew of a certainty that if they ratified the Amendment in the usual way, its future would be subject to eventual fraud and cover up, as it eventually was, even with the best of efforts to prevent that very same thing from happening. After all, a Certificate of Ratification was only a piece of paper, and a piece of paper could be "lost" too easily, couldn't it?. And if "lost" *at the right time* and in the right manner, who would be to say that it "ever existed?" No, a

different course of action ratifying the Amendment was the only way to really do it, because Virginians really cared fervently for their country and the freedom that they had obtained from it; they weren't about to go back to being under King George III, or his descendents, by hook or crook, or under *any* other such monarch, if they could help it.

The Constitution made no restriction or requirement on how they had to show Ratification, only that it had to be done. Since the act of Ratification is an official act of law of a state, any official publishing of an act would be the official declaration of the passage or the establishment of such an act. Making the Ratification of the proposed 13th Amendment a part of a larger body of law, would protect it from the ravages of corrupt politicians in power who were more skilled at polished deceit and lies than they were at long winded prayers in beginning sessions in Congress. By protecting their Ratification in the Act of a body of law, the good men of Virginia, would insure that their efforts would not be stifled by the mere whims of wicked men, that it would be around for generations, despite what might be done to "cover things" up to the contrary. Of course, one must admit that the cover up has been pretty effective, and was pretty well orchestrated, but then again, *they* didn't have the advantages of television and radio in those days, to swiftly expose this kind of fraud and cover up the way that Watergate was handled, on a grandiose scale, so as to leave an indelible impression on the people's mind as to the idea that something dreadfully wrong had taken place.

So, such was Act No. 280 passed by the Virginia legislature (Virginia Archives of Richmond, "misc." file, p. 299 for micro-film), proposed on March 10, 1819 to be printed in a special edition of the **Virginia Civil Code, March 12, 1819**, an act of ratification that ultimately would not have the potential to be just covered up or whisked away without a trace; maybe this idea to do it this way was another inspiration from God Himself to do it this way, so that in the end, all things done would be undone.

In the face of all of the mounds of hard evidence establishing the lawful existence of this true Thirteenth Amendment over the believed existing one (the true Fourteenth Amendment), Mr. Hartgrove still proposes that the only remaining argument against the 13th Amendment's

ratification is that there *appears* to be an alleged (by him) *procedural error* in his records involving the absence of a "certificate of ratification."

The Constitution, not the law passed by Congress (no matter how well intentioned it may have been) was, and is, SUPREME, therefore the requirements of the Constitution outweighed and nullified that of the Congressionally passed, but unenforceable law.

Mr. Hartgrove, or his successors and constituents, needs to be questioned as to *quo warranto*, or "by what authority" that he has, under the Constitution, to hold the nation and its sovereign people, hostage as to their rights, his *claim* to this alleged power and authority, notwithstanding. Mr. Dodge countered Hartgrove's procedural argument by citing some of the Ratification procedures recorded for other states when the 13th Amendment was being considered. He notes that according to the Journal of the House of Representatives, 11th Congress, 2nd Session, on page 241, a "letter" (not a "certificate of ratification") from the Governor of Ohio announcing Ohio's ratification was submitted not to the Secretary of State, but rather to the House of Representatives, where it "was read and ordered to lie on the table." Likewise, "The Kentucky Ratification was also returned to the House, while Maryland's earlier Ratification is *not* listed as having been returned to Congress (at all)." (emphasis added)

The House Journal implies that since Ohio and Kentucky were not required to notify the Secretary of State of their Ratification decisions, there was likewise *no requirement* that Virginia file a "certificate of ratification" with the Secretary of State. If so, by what Law, in the face of these clear findings of fact and conclusions of law, was Virginia to be treated differently than any other state? The fact is, Virginia had the same rights as every other state in the Union, and its Ratification process, however unique, had just as much right to be recognize as any other state's right.

And, another thing. Since when does the submission of an official statement to an individual's boss, an individual whose job it may be to perform (by recognition or otherwise) a specific duty, not become binding on the employee if it ordinarily would be? Who worked for who? Was James Monroe the President of the United States at this time, or was it John Quincy Adams? I believe it was James Monroe. Therefore, Mr. J. Q. Adams, as only the Secretary of State, worked for, and was subject to, the authority of President James Monroe. Another way to look at the whole thing is like this. A legal notice (evidence of ratification) sent to or served upon the big boss (President) of a company (country) is binding upon the entire company (country), automatically. A simple, direct, factual point of law! Therefore, any notice of any decision, by whatever form it may have been derived, served upon (or sent to) the employer, President James Monroe, was equally and forthwith binding upon the Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams, as well, along with the rest of the United States, or either of them! Period.

This act of certified (or bonded) service, became, was, and is, Binding upon the rest of the country also, the entire United States, regardless of whether or not *some officials* want to think so. In addition to the foregoing, as another point of law, a legal notice is considered to have been served (allowing for a reasonably sufficient amount of time for delivery) at the time that the said article of notice has been - with such carrier - deposited, with all necessary postage or other delivery fee prepaid thereon. Therefore John Quincy Adams did not have the barest shred of authority or power to refute, deny or avoid the notice. Nor did Congress. Nor does Congress today. None.

And it is absolutely inconceivable and unacceptable to believe that Adams' boss, President Monroe, did not convey to, or inform him, the fact that he had received a copy of Virginia's re-published Civil Code, containing the "missing" 13th Amendment therein. And it is equally unthinkable that the two other specific parties who were sent copies of this particular publication, namely Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, two of John Q. Adams political enemies, having received such information, would not have immediately mounted an assault against the hated Federalist platform of monarchy and royalism embraced by attorney (or barrister) or Esquire J.Q. Adams and his cronies, and that such a monumental occurrence would just have passed them by as though it meant nothing. They, at the very least, would have made sure that Mr. Adams was aware of what was published and what it meant. And such an occurrence would have been the very kind of end result that would have caused the various states to launch forward into the ordering of copies of the Constitution with the new, ratified Amendment in it, a fact that would NOT have occurred at all if it had not been truly ratified, particularly by Connecticut, who voted against it to begin with!

Again, despite arguments to the contrary, it appears that the "missing," but now found, Amendment was (and is, according to the future will of the people) Constitutionally ratified and shall not be denied because of some *supposed* procedural error ((?)).

We have an Amendment that looks like a duck, walks like a duck, and quacks like a duck, and we do NOT have to know where and how it was hatched to know that it is, in fact, a duck. There is more than just a little proof that the 13th Amendment was at one time considered to be a part of the Constitution, by virtually everybody at large, not just a select few.

What else could explain the fact that it was not until *after* the Civil War that attorney bar associations, not just the International Bar Association headquartered in England, began to spring up everywhere?

WE HAVE A THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT, WHICH READS:

"If any citizen of the United States shall accept, claim, receive, or retain any title of nobility or honour, or shall without the consent of Congress, accept and retain any present, pension, office, or emolument of any kind whatever, from any emperor, king, prince, or foreign power, such person shall cease to be a citizen of the United States, and shall be incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under them, or either of them."

The True 13th Amendment did in fact pass in 1819, and the Amendment that we *now* regard as the "thirteenth amendment" is actually the 14th Amendment, just as it was in the case of the Colorado version of the Constitution, in 1867 which showed it exactly that way, and our current "fourteenth amendment" is actually the 15th Amendment, and so forth and so on (so far as we know).

All of these things now considered, it becomes quite clear that the introduction of the power of attorneys or lawyers at bar, or barristers, to be manipulated and controlled by the Money Masters, the World Bankers, the so called World Elite Dominion, or WED, was married to the political systems of this country, once the True 13th Amendment was successfully suppressed and covered up. **But great enough sums of money can do many powerful and fantastic things that the People would not ordinarily believe could be accomplished by anyone otherwise, and in corrupt application of law, *much* money is at stake.** And so it was with the

beginning (or re-beginning) of the Bar associations here in the United States, beginning with the American Bar Association, started in Ohio (in a little town now a suburb of Cleveland), supposedly started to shut out foreign attorneys, as immigrants, who were making their way into the United States and in that little town in Ohio at the time, followed thereafter by all of the other bar associations.

But the question arises, *why did they*, these Ohio attorneys, choose to call themselves a "Bar" association of all organizational names that *could have been* chosen? Since the existence of the International Bar had historically been all but erased from within the "legal borders" of the United States, *what* prompted those particular attorneys to latch upon that particular word as the definitive word to describe their particular organization? Coincidence? Hardly. Coincidences of this magnitude rarely if ever happen. And then there is the issue that European foreigners, particularly *European attorneys*, would likely already know about the existence of the infamous and feared International Bar Association from England, and would realize that *if* it was in fact the "officially recognized legal entity" here in America, there would be little if any chance of them (the new attorneys in town) beating that old European monster, the IBA, itself, even if only as a matter of an alleged indirect link thereto. *Perhaps a link of this type with "Mother England" again just might provide the locals and others willing to join them certain advantages. . . .*

No, there was obviously something much more sinister at work here, more ominous, more "monsterish" in its nature. A rekindling of an old spirit or cause perhaps. After all, a monster of any type, even a "legal one," as everybody knows, is a powerful creature to be feared and respected, even if it takes crushing the hapless and innocent beneath its feet in order to get its own way. But it must not appear as the old monster revived. It must be covered up, made to look deceptively innocent, Americanized, good old boy-ish if you will. **In other words, the true name of the American Bar Association, extended completely out, would be, and is: the American-British Accreditation Registry Association, which has kept the United States tied to mother England in all of its foreign affairs and other dealings, and to the Money Masters, or WED, from that day to this. And what is it that which is said; "ignorance is no excuse." The fact that law school graduates, as attorneys, thereafter join various BAR associations all over the United States today, unknowingly, unwittingly, as to the allegiance that they owe to the World Bankers (even though done in ignorance), many of whom (World Bankers) are still headquartered largely in London, England, and which as a matter of Law, are under the crown heads of England and the rest of Europe, establishes that all of such BAR members, as Esquires, are in fact in allegiance to a foreign prince or power.**

Consequently, when these things are proven in a court of True Law, one in which an impartial jury (not peers), neither biased or prejudiced, has been impaneled to serve the People directly, under direct authority and direction, word for word, of the Constitution, not by the word substitution games of Chief Justice John Marshall in 1803, and it is subsequently established that all Esquires of any British Accreditation Registry in fact *ultimately* owe their allegiance to a foreign prince or power, then all attorneys or lawyers who do not immediately renounce their membership therein will immediately cease to be Citizens of the United States, and except they shall expediently obtain special permission to stay IN this country by an applicable governmental organization NOT ultimately established by or under the authority and/or influence of Esquires, if any, they will become, forthwith, subject to deportation, as ALIENS, non citizens, from the borders of the United States of America into such other country, if any, as will have them.

Do not take this as a joke, for there are many of those "ordinary Americans" *who would gladly escort all such resisting bar attorneys to the borders in a heartbeat*, just to get rid of them, so badly are they, bar attorneys, now hated in so many different circles, and places, in our society. We wonder what country, if any, will be willing to take therein all of the bar attorneys who will become subject to deportation (except they immediately renounce their membership in their respective BAR associations) as non-citizens, considering what the reputation of such lawyers have become as a matter of centuries of underhanded skullduggery, lying (they are liars after all), back-stabbings, conspiracies, thievings, and even manslaughters and murders caused by them, all under the pretext that they alone should be able to determine the proper implementation of law, under the pretext of "practice," practice being a principle of a thing that is not good enough to present to the public first, without first (secretly) executing the thing outside of the public's view. It is highly doubtful that any country with a sane government will be willing to take on the sudden refuse of our society, hundreds of thousands to millions of lawyers who are suddenly no longer Citizens of the United States.

There are some who believe that lawyers in general are okay to have around in a society, but all of the Founding Fathers did not agree with that viewpoint. In fact, as a matter of historical knowledge, I believe it was in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania prior to the days of the Founding of the Constitution itself, or in the "Colonial Days," there was a law on the books of the City that made it illegal to "be an attorney," such was their hatred and distrust therein for attorneys. This is the real reason that the Sixth Amendment to the Constitution uses the word "Counsel," instead of "Lawyer," "Attorney," or even "Barrister," notwithstanding that they knew of the existence of those words in that day and age; the Founding Father(s) of the Sixth Amendment were, in a very subtle sort of way, trying to nullify the terrible power that attorneys had had over the People for centuries, by making any Citizen inclined to give Assistance of Counsel, equal to all attorneys, lawyers, etc., in any Case involving criminal proceedings, thereby removing from the system of monopoly by attorneys, lawyers and the like. Bear in mind that in the phrase "Assistance of Counsel" contained in the Sixth Amendment, nothing is indicated as to whether this Assistance is to be paid for or unpaid, therefore it could be "unpaid," a principle upon which no attorney in business operates on, and furthermore, Assistance can be rendered in both of two primary forms: advice given AND representation of the person charged, for no one can deny the fact that some people are inadequate when it comes to speaking out for themselves, but other interested Citizens, not attorneys, lawyers and the like, may have that ability and can therefore speak for them, or represent them accordingly, and thereby provide for them "Assistance" within the meaning of the word in the Constitution, Sixth Amendment.

The effort to stop the rampant and unchecked raging of "bar" attorneys or lawyers in our society was given all motivation to propose and pass the True Thirteenth Amendment when it was discovered that King George III, under the aegis of the Bank of England, was *still* trying to control the United States, through "Bar" Attorneys or Lawyers who were allegedly our very "own Citizens," because they (our own "Citizens") obviously lacked the moral fiber as a whole to protect the true interests of the People of the United States themselves. And those continued efforts to control the People of the United States by the Bank of England is still alive and well today, through its successful establishment of the American-British Accreditation Registry Association, and all derivatives therefrom, keeping in mind that it would have been impossible after the Civil War, even with the successful suppression of the True Thirteenth Amendment, for it to have reestablished the International Bar Association, headquartered in London, England,

inasmuch at this act would have been too obvious, and would have likely caused some to have good cause to remember the True Thirteenth Amendment immediately, and made an issue of it, so obvious would it have become as to "what was really going on," and the aforesaid Amendment would NOT have "missing" too long, or long enough (which they hoped would be forever) under such a blatant and outright obvious condition or act. So instead, they thought that if they simply made it "American," then everything would be okay, and that those gullible Americans would buy it, and they certainly did, sorry to say, until now.

To expect any attorney or lawyer of any BAR association, in light of this information, to be expected to either prosecute or hold for the missing (but now found) *True* Thirteenth Amendment, might be asking for too much; it would ordinarily constitute a conflict of interest for them to do so, and any attorney or lawyer who did so while maintaining membership in any BAR association whatsoever would be regarded as extremely suspect. Maybe there are some Bar attorneys out there somewhere that can prove us wrong on this point. This is one of the difficulties surrounding the (true) Thirteenth Amendment, not that its rightful existence and authority hasn't been more than adequately proven, but rather that those who have seized the control of the courts and the legislatures and executive positions, are mainly (bar) attorneys, and are feared, having clearly become regarded as being a "Noble Class" of Citizens, a condition which was forbidden by the Constitution itself before the (true) Thirteenth Amendment ever became an issue for proposal. Only special juries made up of non-attorneys, not being members of any BAR association, can justly determine the truthfulness of the Case fairly, and render the appropriate verdict accordingly.

WE DO HAVE A TRUE THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT, THOUGH ONCE "MISSING," IS NOW FOUND, AND IT IS OURS TO EMBRACE FOREVER: THEREFORE, LET US ASSEMBLE TOGETHER, UPON THE MOUNTAIN TOPS, DOWN IN THE VALLEYS, OUT ON THE PLAINS, THE RIVERS AND OUT UPON THE OCEANS, AND LET US BOLDLY AND BRAVELY PROCLAIM THIS GREAT WORK OF OUR FORE FATHERS AS HAVING BEEN RECLAIMED ONCE AGAIN, FOR OURSELVES AND FOR OUR POSTERITY. LET US MAKE OUR VOICES HEARD, RINGING OUT ALOUD, WITH GREATER AND GREATER LOUDNESS, LIKE OUR LIBERTY BELL, BEFORE OUR GOVERNMENTS, UNTIL WE ARE HEARD AGAIN INDEED, AND LET US NOT, NO, NEVER, TAKE "NO" FOR AN ANSWER. SO, THEN LET US FORGE ON, UNTIL WE RAISE THE VICTORY SHOUT . . . "NEVERMORE, OH CORRUPT GOVERNMENT. NEVERMORE. FOR VICTORY IS *OURS*, AND THE SHAME IS *YOURS*, FOREVER! AMEN!"

SINCERELY TO YOU, MY GOOD AMERICAN PEOPLE.